



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 26, 2022

Mr. Brian Sears
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2022-22015

Dear Mr. Sears:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 962021 (PIR No. 22-1075).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for communications between named department employees and other named individuals and specified entities during a stated period of time.¹ You state the department will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of the Office of the Governor (the "governor's office"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the department notified the governor's office of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the governor's office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you and the governor's office raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for the information at issue, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, no portion of the completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.111. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address the arguments under this section for the information at issue. Additionally, because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will also consider your argument under this section for the completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). Rather than merely making a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement, the governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Record Decision No. 252 (1980) (section 552.108 designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment). However, section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable to generally known policies

and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You claim the information you indicated is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. You assert release of the information at issue “would provide wrong-doers, drug traffickers, terrorists, and other criminals with invaluable information concerning how [d]epartment operations are planned, implemented, and staffed[;] the techniques used to investigate and detect activities of suspected criminal elements; how information is assessed and analyzed; and the lessons learned from the analysis of prior criminal activities.” You further assert release of this information “will compromise law enforcement purposes by enabling terrorists and criminals to anticipate weaknesses in law enforcement procedures and alter their methods of operation in order to avoid detection and apprehension.” Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated release of the information you indicated would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.*

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You and the governor's office state some of the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of department employees and individuals with whom the department shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking matters. You and the governor's office also inform us the information at issue includes a draft document that reflects deliberations regarding policymaking matters, which was intended for release in its final form. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you and the governor's office have demonstrated some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking or has been shared with an individual with whom the department has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you and the governor's office have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the department.

⁴ As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against its disclosure.

Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 418.176 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Section 418.176 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and

(1) relates to staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency; [or]

(2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider[.]

Id. § 418.176(a)(1), (2). Section 418.177 provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Id. § 418.177. The fact that information may generally be related to emergency preparedness does not make the information *per se* confidential under the provisions of the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996). As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting these sections must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the provisions. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The governor’s office claims some of the remaining information is confidential under sections 418.176 and 418.177 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the governor’s office has failed to demonstrate the information at issue relates to staffing requirements or a tactical plan of an emergency response provider or relates to an

assessment by or for a governmental entity that was collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the department or the governor's office for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with either section 418.176 or 418.177 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides:

[T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You assert the information you indicated is confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code. However, upon review, we conclude you have not established any portion of the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has held common-law privacy protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department: (1) may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code; (2) may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code; and (3) must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/jxd

Ref: ID# 962021

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party
(w/o enclosures)